

F.E. Levin

## FORMS OF PATRIOTISM OF THE EARLY MODERN IRISH NOBILITY

The article is dedicated to the phenomenon of patriotism of the Irish nobility in the reign of early Stuarts, when specific loyalist consciousness of distinction within the composite British state of the Roman Catholic subjects, both of Old English and Gaelic descent, was formed.

The author suggests a term 'patrimonial patriotism', which combines both medieval and new aspects, for describing patriotism in early modern Ireland. He compares and contrasts different forms of patriotism in Stuart Ireland: Old English traditional allegiances, Irish patriotism of both Old English and Gaels and also a distinct Gaelic dimension of patriotism. The Old English patriotism is rather to be considered seigneurial loyalty since their constitutional, territorial and historical legitimacy was based on their motherland in England. Patrimonial patriotism of Old English and Gaels was characterized by loyalty to Catholicism and the Stuart's dynasty. The most complete form of Irish patriotism supposed appropriation of the Gaelic past and cultural practices and at the same time acknowledging the legitimacy of the English invasion. In the Gaelic dimension of patriotism loyalty to Stuarts was combined with non-recognition of the legitimacy of the English invasion and disappointment with the collapse of the traditional Gaelic order.

The author highlights that common features of these forms of patriotism were, in part, their politicized, monarchical and Catholic nature, their feeling of distinction and non-Englishness and their non-modern character. He also points out that the case of Ireland shows patriotism is not restricted to only ethnic and territorial aspects, but is always mixed with other elements. Refs 57.

**Keywords:** patrimonial patriotism, early Modern Ireland, Irish nobility, composite state, patriotism, pre-modern identities.

**For citation:** Levin F.E. Forms of patriotism of the early modern Irish nobility. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. History*, 2017, vol. 62, issue 1, pp. 69–81. DOI: 10.21638/11701/spbu02.2017.106

Ф. Е. Левин

## ФОРМЫ ПАТРИОТИЗМА ИРЛАНДСКОЙ ЗНАТИ В РАННЕЕ НОВОЕ ВРЕМЯ

Статья посвящена феномену патриотизма ирландской знати при ранних Стюартах, в правление которых у католических подданных староанглийского и гэльского происхождения сформировалось самосознание собственной особенности.

В качестве термина для описания патриотизма в Ирландии раннего Нового времени автор предлагает «патримониальный патриотизм», вмещающий в себя как средневековые, так и новые аспекты. В Средние века «patria» имела территориальные, правовые и политические коннотации. Сравниваются различные формы патриотизма в стюартовской Ирландии: традиционная лояльность старых англичан, ирландский патриотизм староанглийских и гэльских элит, а также особенное гэльское измерение патриотизма. Формы староанглийского патриотизма, считает автор, стоит воспринимать скорее как сеньориальную лояльность, поскольку их правовая, территориальная и историческая легитимность базировалась на родине в Англии. Патримониальный патриотизм старых англичан и гэлов характеризовался верностью католицизму и династии Стюартов. В наиболее полной форме ирландский патриотизм, лучше всего представленный в «Основе знаний об Ирландии» Джоффри Китинга, предполагал признание гэльского прошлого и культурных практик и в то же самое время признание леги-

Levin Feliks Evgenyevich — Research Associate, Philipp University of Marburg, Marburg, Biegenstraße 10, 35032, Germany; vitabrevis620@gmail.com

Левин Феликс Евгеньевич — стажер-исследователь, Марбургский университет имени Филиппа, Марбург, Бигенштрассе, 10, 35032, Марбург, Германия; vitabrevis620@gmail.com

Статья выполнена в рамках гранта РГНФ 16-01-00108 «Институты, теория и практика западноевропейских монархий XVII–XVIII веков». This research fulfils the terms of a grant from the Russian Fund for Research in the Humanities (N 16-01-001018), 'Institutions, Theory and Practise of West European Monarchies of the 17 and 18th centuries'.

© Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, 2017

тимности английского завоевания. Гэльское измерение патриотизма вмещало в себя и мотивы любви к родине, и лояльность Стюартам, и непризнание законности английского завоевания, и разочарование, связанное с упадком традиционного гэльского порядка.

Среди общих черт этих форм патриотизма автор выделяет политизированность, а также их монархическую и католическую природу, самосознание личности и неанглийскость, подчеркивает их немодерный характер. Ирландские формы патриотизма представляли собой своеобразный конформизм элит. В то же самое время они артикулировали чувство собственной личности, но поскольку данное чувство было различным у представителей элиты, появилось несколько форм патриотизма. Автор также утверждает, что ирландский кейс показывает, что патриотизм не ограничивается только этническими или территориальными аспектами, но всегда смешивается с другими элементами. Библиогр. 57 назв.

*Ключевые слова:* патримониальный патриотизм, Ирландия в раннее Новое время, ирландская знать, композитарное государство, домодерные идентичности.

The early Modern Age was a period of profound change for Ireland. Involved in British state-building, it had undergone a processes of re-territorialization [Verner, Gshhnizer, Kozellek, Sheneman 2014, pp. 387–463] typical for emerging early Modern European territorial states. Gradual decay of medieval realities, re-organization of power structures and sophistication of social relations in their turn led to the transformation of medieval identities and loyalties.

The peculiarity of the Ireland's case is defined by two factors. Firstly, since 1541, when Henry VIII acquired the crown of Ireland, it had been incorporated in the British composite monarchy [Elliott; 1992, pp. 48–71; Fedorov 2013b, pp. 473–484; Fedorov 2011, pp. 202–224] which reached its peak during the rule of the early Stuarts' period. Even though the British project placed the values of the domineering ethnicity, that of the English, in the foreground, it acknowledged existence of historical and cultural significance of subordinate ethnic groups which could articulate their identity within the composite state [Fedorov 2013b]. Secondly, the 16 and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries were a transitional period for Ireland during which new and traditional identities co-existed with each other, so there was an amalgama of political, religious, social and ethnic loyalties permeating the island.

Patrimonial patriotism in the early Stuarts' period discussed in the article is such kind of a phenomenon which combines both medieval and new aspects. It could emerge in an articulate form during the reign of the Stuarts dynasty, with whom the expectations and hopes of Roman Catholic subjects, both of Old English and Gaelic descent, were associated. The case of Irish patrimonial patriotism presents an original insight into the identity processes in early Modern Ireland, a debatable issue in Irish historiography.

The formation of Irish identity and consciousness in the 16 and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries is a bone of contention among students of early Modern Ireland. On the one hand, Patrick Corish [Corish 1968], Brendan Bradshaw [Bradshaw 1979a, pp. 66–80], Marc Caball [Caball 2009; 1994; 1998, p. 112–139] and Bernadette Cunningham [Cunningham 2004] posit the emergence of Irish Catholic consciousness as a response to the English policy, or “westward enterprise” as Bradshaw puts it, in Ireland and emphasize the role of Counter-Reformation and Gaelic revival. On the basis of the analysis of Gaelic bardic poetry and history-writing they conclude that instead of customary Gaelic particularism of the elites an insular consciousness began to take shape. They highlight anti-English sentiment of this consciousness. Therefore, these scholars place Ireland in the context of state-building and formation of consciousness in Latin Europe.

On the other hand, Tom Dunne and Michelle O Riordan [O Riordan 1990] are skeptical about any common consciousness among Gaelic elites. According to Dunne, Gaelic elites were pragmatic in their attitude towards English conquest and stuck to their local coordinates. Gaelic literature was unable to respond to colonialism because of the scale of the changes [Dunne 1980, p. 30], and in spite of its negative stance it was apolitical being devoid of any political programme [Dunne 1980, p. 29]. So, in his opinion, one should not exaggerate politicization of Gaelic elites and seek there the roots of Irish nationalism.

In this article I would like to combine the two approaches and examine the issue from another perspective. I neither want to contest the fact that Irish identity was articulated in early Modern time, nor am I inclined to deny a certain level of pragmatism of the Irish elites. Therefore, specific loyalist consciousness of distinction within the composite state, which took shape during the reign of the early Stuarts, is going to be discussed here.

One should start with some theoretical considerations in order to clarify what is meant by '*patrimonial patriotism*'. Medieval forms of patriotism are not the same as contemporary perceptions of it. Throughout the Middle Ages '*patria*' meant judicial or emotional attachment. It was connected with the territory but at the same time it was an invariably personal basis for the connection of the individual belonging to one or another law system: according to his origin (*natio*) a person had the right to be tried by the law of the country of his birth (*lex patriae*) [Verner, Gshhnizer, Kozellek, Sheneman 2014, p. 431]. Thus, the concept of '*patria*' emphasised internal and personal connection of the individual with his 'personal' fatherland [Verner, Gshhnizer, Kozellek, Sheneman 2014, p. 436] and thus, left some scope for an individual choice.

The medieval processes of territorialization resulted in *patria* (fatherland) beginning to be associated with the bigger territory of the realm. This was the case of France in which *patria communis* was understood as territorial unit which had essential validity and coincided with the territory of the realm (*regnum*) [Post 1953, pp. 281–282]. Therefore, '*patria*' bore territorial, judicial and political connotations.

"*Patriot*" meant a citizen of a country as a whole who was ascribed to certain laws and rights [Leerssen 2006, p. 75]. Besides that, there are also two points of concern. "*Patria*" could often be associated not only with the realm but rather with the region of birth [Elliott 1969, p. 48] or with one's political fatherland. Another thing to consider is the object of love. It could be neither the state, nor the land but the freedom guaranteed by the state/republic. If the latter failed to guarantee it, a person "withdrew" his patriotism. It was borrowed in this sense by Renaissance thinkers, such as Machiavelli, from Antiquity [Patriotism 2001, p. 407].

Generally, patrimonial patriotism could take various shapes but there were territorial and judicial aspects ('*patria*' is the place where you live and which feeds you) crystallising in it. Moreover, it was monarchical by nature.

The phenomenon of patrimonial patriotism emerged after the accession of James I Stuart, who meant hope (*dóchas*) for the Catholic Old English and Gaelic elites [Ó Buachalla 1983], though it was triggered by the acquisition of a new constitutional status of Ireland in 1541, in Brendan Bradshaw's opinion [Bradshaw 1979b, pp. 267–288]. Even without clearly articulated patriotism the majority of Irish Catholic elites had conformist attitudes and regardless of their ethnic origins were characterized by two levels of allegiance: to the Stuart dynasty and Catholicism [Ó Buachalla 1990, pp. 410–413]. Thus,

there were different discourses of patriotism in early Modern Ireland but the most comprehensive form of it was the Irish identity forged by Irish intellectual elites.

The Old English were notable for their conservativeness and traditional fealty to the English crown [Frame 2005, p. 151]. However, the Reformation in Ireland transformed their traditional loyalties and left them with a dilemma of simultaneous loyalties to the pope as ecclesiastical authority and to the monarch as secular authority [Clarke 1966, p. 21]. James I was not satisfied with such twofold loyalties and demanded whole loyalty, and so for this reason he regarded Catholics as 'half-subjects' [Ó Buachalla 1983, p. 88; Calendar of the... 1872, p. 350] (the state required whole loyalty). In spite of this the Old English still considered themselves to be bulwarks of English rule in Ireland and claimed to be the most loyal and obedient subjects of the crown. For example, we can allude to Francis Nugent's words, an Irish priest of the Capuchin Order "... I owe him all fidelity, and service, and I will spare no pains, in my ways to give true demonstrations of the due respect I bear to him and his royal issue." [Martin 1962, p. 207].

Yet we should bear in mind that the outward loyalty towards Stuart dynasty was directed by pragmatic considerations. It was the only way to secure their religion as the Old English rejected other methods such as rebellion. Moreover, it was the official position of the Irish clerical circles voiced by Peter Lombard, archbishop of Armagh and Primate of All Ireland from 1601 to 1625. The archbishop who previously supported the case of the O'Neill declaring his conflict with Elisabeth "the war of religion"<sup>1</sup> withdrew his advocacy shortly after the accession of James I and began propagating legitimacy of the secular authority of the English monarch [Ó Buachalla 1983, pp. 95–96]. He recommended the Church to steer clear of political affairs and to refrain from appointing Church officials, who were close to the exiled earls O'Neill or O'Donnell, or their tenants so as to be safe from potential persecutions [Ó Buachalla 1983, pp. 95–96]. According to him, refusal from acknowledging James I meant a crime of lese-majeste [Silke 1955, pp. 124–150].

Even though the Old English did not articulate their patriotism explicitly, their judicial awareness coupled with the loyalty to the throne was evident. Brendan Bradshaw sees changes in the English attitudes after 1541 and claims that the liberal concept of commonwealth gave rise to Irish political nationalism. The Old English patriotism, according to Bradshaw, in the 16–17 centuries revolved around liberties, constitutional sovereignty and autonomy of Ireland and attachment to the 'native land' [Bradshaw 1979b, pp. 277–278].

Having been displaced from power structures and suffering from redistribution of property to plantations, as well as the enforcement of the oath of allegiance, the Old English elites sent complaints and grievances throughout the first half of the 17 century hoping for his Majesty's grace. They regarded the king as a shield protecting them from incursions against Catholic religion [Canny 2001, p. 408], and during the time of the Confederate Wars in Ireland the Confederates were determined to limit the authority of the Parliament rather than the prerogatives of the crown [Canny 2001, p. 407].

In the Confederate period, Old English political leaders acted in accordance with their principles and demanded full sovereign status of Ireland united to English crown, which enabled them to legislate for themselves [Canny 2001, p. 407]. They used the king's name to justify their actions. As they wrote: "whatsoever they now did was by authority from the king, they were the Queen's soldiers and the King's subjects, and poor gentlemen

---

<sup>1</sup> See [Lombard 1632].

in distress' [Canny 2001, p. 540]. The rebels explained their actions as the only true way to defend their rights and honour of the Majesty. "For preventing, therefore, of such evils growing upon us in this kingdom, we have, for the preservation of his Majesty's honour and our own liberties ..." [Calendar of the... 1901, p. 347]. Therefore, they explicitly declared their loyalty to the king identifying themselves as 'loyal servants', 'loyal lieges' or 'subjects' of the crown.

The issue of attachment to the territory and identification with its history was more complicated. The Old English, especially living on the Pale, retained their Englishness and associated themselves with the history of England and its liberties, which Colin Kidd calls 'gothic constitutionalism' [Kidd 2004, p. 154]. In spite of the starting process of rapprochement between the Old English and Gaelic population, these groups of society treated the native population the latter treated the former in a superior way, supported the policy of anglicisation as the instrument of civilizing 'barbarians', and maintained their colonial identity<sup>2</sup>.

We should pay attention to the fact that the territorial attachment of the Old English was as twofold as their allegiances. They maintained their ethnic kinship with their motherland: 'loyal and dutiful people of this land of Ireland being now for the most part derived from British ancestors' [Hill 1995, pp. 280–281]. Furthermore, as it has been said earlier, England was their political motherland too. For example, Patrick Darcy, a Catholic lawyer from Galway, one of the intellectual leaders of the Confederates, wrote in his 'Argument' that the subjects of that kingdom must be governed by Common Laws of England [Darcy 1641].

The territorial-specific legitimacy of the Old English was based not only on traditional references to the bull 'Laudabiliter' issued by the Pope Adrian IV which granted the right to Henry II to invade and govern Ireland with the purpose of restoring the true faith on this island, and conquest of the abovementioned English king but also on the Arthurian myth developed by historians of the Tudor Age, according to which the Irish were tributaries of the British king Arthur and were part of the British realm (this idea stemmed from Geoffrey of Monmouth's claim) [Hadfield 1993]. Thus, their presence on the island was justified by right of the conquest, and they identified themselves with the Anglo-Norman history of Ireland only after 1171. This group's perceptions of the history of Ireland were expressed in the narratives of such antiquarians of the Tudor and Stuart age as William Camden, Edmund Spenser, Richard Stanyhurst, Meredith Hanmer, Raphael Holinshed who proved English superiority over native population of Ireland.

Therefore, seigneurial loyalty<sup>3</sup> rather than patrimonial patriotism would suit this group of the Old English. Their constitutional awareness was more developed than their territorial attachment while their constitutional, territorial and historical legitimacy was based on their motherland in England. So they pledged allegiance to the king, whom they could ask for protection from Protestant and Gaelic neighbours.

Yet it was not the sole position of the Old English. Both Old English and Gaelic emigres set new trends. Secular and clerical intellectuals teaching and studying in the seminaries of Louvain, Bordeaux, Douai and Salamanca actualised discursive practices under the influence of Counter-Reformation and continental history-writing. Historians asso-

---

<sup>2</sup> See [Canny 1988, p. 1–101; Canny 2001, p. 1–58].

<sup>3</sup> For example, abovementioned Francis Nugent called himself 'a vassal to his Majesty' [Martin 1962, p. 207].



ciate the growth of insular consciousness with them, and in their works we can find the designation '*Irish*'.

It is worth mentioning that the process of territorialization in Ireland intensified by the acquisition of the kingly status made two ethnic communities (Old English and Gaelic), who had shared common territory and lived together for a long time, reconsider their identity owing to the Reformation in Ireland and land and authority re-distribution.

In the face of the transformations the Catholic elites realized the necessity of new territorial legitimacy and forged Irish identity. Even before the early Modern time Old English families of Munster and Connacht were gaelicised (used Irish language and adjusted to Irish legal practices). In these areas of intercultural communication and fusion of lifestyles [Hayes-McCoy 2009, p. 99] processes of mutual acculturation took place, and because of the necessity to conduct business both sides were able to switch from Irish to English and vice versa [Canny 1988, pp. 31–68]. Emigres originated from this environment.

This new alliance of groups, who had reconsidered their identity, began to be referred as "Irish", the term which we meet in the sources more frequently in the 16 and 17 centuries. Breandán Ó Buachalla emphasizes that the concept of "Irish" had a very concrete semantic meaning: loyalty to Catholicism and to the dynasty of Stuarts [Ó Buachalla 1990, pp. 410–413]. However, the usage of this designation is always in need of contextualization.

Continently trained priests of both Old English and Gaelic descent such as Hugh McCaughwell, Thomas Messingham and Tadhg O Cianain signified Irish as Catholic nation. Peter Lombard wrote: "Catholicism is the one unifying factor in Irish life; it is the fact that makes an Irishman" [Silke 1955, p. 128]. Suffice it to say that the community of Irish as the total of Catholic subjects of the monarch implied judicial-confessional foundation and excluded Protestant population.

The motif of the fatherland permeated the *oeuvre* of the Irish abroad of both descents. Furthermore, the frequency of using the territorial names for the entire island in the texts produced in Ireland and abroad increased in comparison to previous centuries [Leerssen 1986, p. 216]. They referred to their homeland as '*patria*' or '*atharthacht*' (fatherland). For example, Geoffrey Keating, a Catholic priest of Old English descent, created some "patriotic" verses actualizing insular identity. In "Mo bheannacht leat, a scríbhinn" [Dánta amhrain is... 1900, pp. 17–18] ("My blessing on you, o written word") he glorifies the Holy Island ('inis naofa') of Ireland and its nature.

A Jesuit Conor Mahony also addressed his compatriots during the Confederate Wars in "*Exhortatio*": "My fellow Irishmen, you have splendid leaders in war, well skilled in military science and very brave soldiers, who in numbers and courage are much superior to their enemies. Our Ireland, a most fruitful and fertile kingdom, abounds in food for times of war and peace" [Ó Fiaich 2001, p. 34]. In the same vein Padraigin eéad, a Dominican (Old English priest), appealed to the Catholics to join the Confederate Army "Éirigh mo Dhúiche le Dia" ("Arise my native land with God") — "Caithfidh fíor Éireann uile ó aicme go haonduine i dtír mbreic na mbinnecheann slim gleic n-a timcheall nó tuitim" [Saothar filidheachta an... 1916, p. 95]. ("All people of Ireland from clans to single persons living in the land of graceful dappled summits must unite or fall" [McCabe 2005, p. 271]).

Patrimonial patriotism in its most complete form revealed itself in the historical narratives. The level of patriotism depended on the level of identification with pre Anglo-Norman history of Ireland. The historical texts produced in early Modern Ireland were

a part of discursive competition for maintaining a certain version of historical memory. There were two lines of legitimacy and of focus respectively — secular and ecclesiastical histories of Ireland.

Two narratives which combined secular and ecclesiastical paradigms of the history of Ireland were the “Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland” (Annála Ríoghachta Éireann) compiled by Michéal Ó Cléirigh and his colleagues and “Foras Feasa ar Éirinn” (“The Foundation of the Knowledge of Ireland”) written by Geoffrey Keating. These narratives demonstrated continuity of the history of the new sovereign kingdom of Ireland, and for this purpose they used sources in Irish language and traditional medieval plots.

Geoffrey Keating resorts to “Lebor Gabála Éirenn” [Lebor Gabála Éirenn 1938, 1939, 1940, 1941, 1956]. (The Book of Invasions of Ireland) as a framework for his narrative. “Lebor Gabála” narrates the history of Ireland from the creation of the World to the Anglo-Norman Invasion and its conquests by six successive tribes, the last of which, the Milesians, the ancestors of the Gaels, claimed the land for good. Furthermore, it was the best source to be used for such utilitarian purposes as tracing the continuity [Kidd 2004, pp. 146–177].

Keating reproduces and partly modifies conceptual schemes of “Lebor Gabála” and is determined to show inherent civility of the Irish which goes back to its pre-Christian past. He distinguishes between the Gaels and the Old English since they had different origins, the latter descended from the sons of Japheth, Magogus and Homerus, and confirms that the history of Ireland is primarily the history of the Gaels [Keating 1902, pp. 208–209]. Nevertheless, he mentioned Irish (Éireannaigh) concerning the contemporary time meaning Irish and Old English Catholics.

The history of Ireland in “Foras Feasa ar Éirinn” and “Annals of the kingdom of Ireland” was represented as continuity. In order to present Ireland before the invasion as a centralized kingdom and to promote high-kingship the compilers of the “Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland” downgraded the status of the local kings [Cunningham 2010, p. 117]. Moreover, the English monarchy was represented as one of the stages of the historical development of Ireland. Geoffrey Keating, like others among the Old English, acknowledges the Anglo-Norman Invasion. Firstly, this is just because of the right of conquest and thus the invocation of “Lebor Gabála”. Secondly, it is legitimate because of the Papal bull “Laudabiliter” thus giving the sanction of Rome [Keating 1908, pp. 346–351]. Thirdly, Irish nobility voluntarily pledged allegiance to Henry II, even the high king of Ireland Ruaidhri O Conchubhair [Keating 1908, pp. 342–343]. Fourthly, it turned out to be a blessing for the island because the conquerors guaranteed the rights of the local population and promoted the development of Christianity, unlike contemporary Protestant planters [Keating 1908, pp. 368–369].

Loyalty to the Stuart dynasty was another feature of these narratives. The dynasty had Milesian genealogy, and Keating traces them from Eber, son of Mil of Spain. He writes that Stuarts were pre-destined to govern Ireland because wherever Lia Fáil, the inaugural stone of Irish high kings, appeared, a man of the Gaelic descent stepped on it to possess Ireland [Keating 1902, pp. 206–207]. Loyalty to the crown supposed condemnation of the rebellions against it, as is seen in the “Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland” concerning its negative attitude to rebellion of Hugh O'Neill [Ó Buachalla 1993, p. 22].

Therefore, historical legitimacy of Irish identity in Keating's interpretation was based on shared territory since the 12 century (kinship and marriage ties), knowledge of the

Irish language, and shared qualities: respect for strict social hierarchy (loyalty to the crown, laws and the Catholic church<sup>4</sup>), courage, learning and, of course, deep Catholic faith preserved for ages. Keating's patriotism is complete because it appropriated the past of Gaelic history and their cultural practices: respect and pride in Irish ecclesiastical and secular history before the Anglo-Normans, loyalty to the Stuart dynasty and Catholicism, and acknowledgment of the English invasion.

Irish identity in Keating's interpretation had both ethnocultural and ethnopolitical components. The Irish discourse of both "Foras Feasa ar Éirinn" and "Annals of the kingdom of Ireland" was the discourse of particularism within the British composite state because it actualized the consciousness of distinction (Joep Leerssen calls it "non-Englishness") [Leerssen 1986, p. 376].

There was also a Gaelic dimension of patrimonial patriotism different from Keating's version. This included praise poetry addressed to the Stuart dynasty and traditional territorial motifs, and still preserved borders between Gaels (Gaoidhil) and Galls (Gaill). Ethnocultural aspect of Gaelic patriotism was approximately similar from author to author, whereas the addressees of their literary production differed.

Breandán Ó Buachalla assumes that James was the only king who exercised such absolute power in Ireland which nobody had exercised before [Ó Buachalla 1983, p. 128] because he was supported by the majority of the Gaelic families and especially by the learned class. They considered him to be of their own stock and regarded him as a high king. As it was said earlier, Stuarts possessed such kind of genealogy which traced them not only to both sons of Mil, Eber and Eremon, but also to all provinces of Ireland [Ó Buachalla 1983, p. 126]. Because of the fact that James I could be easily incorporated in their traditional schemes, the loyalty to his crown co-existed with denial of legitimacy of Anglo-Norman Invasion.

The intellectuals created a genre of *dóchas* (hope) in which they linked their hopes with James I, and praised him. The learned classes titled James "our illustrious king" (Hugh McCaughwell); "An ghrian loineardha do las; scaoileadh gach ceo Cing Seamas; ... súil chobhartha ar riogh do-róigh tar bríogh ndomharbhta ar ndobróin" ("The brilliant sun has lit up, King James is the dispersal of all mist... the helping eye of our King supersedes the lasting force of our sorrow") [Ó Buachalla 1993, p. 10] by Eochaidh Ó hEodhasa, and eagerly adapted the notion of the three crowns: "Trí corona i gcairt Shéamais — cia dhiobh nachar dheighfhéaghais?... Cuirfidhior — is cubhaidh lais- trí coróna um cheann Séamais... Prionnsa óg go n-aighneadh ard... coróin iongantach Éireann ("Three crowns — 'tis fitting for him — shall be placed on James's head... That young prince shall have Ireland's crown...") by Eoghan Rua Mac an Bhaird [Ó Buachalla 1993, p. 10]. Irish learned classes adopted the idea of the impermissibility of rebellion against the king in spite of his non-Catholic religion and blamed rebels for actions 'against the king' or 'against the law of the king' [Ó Buachalla 1983, p. 128].

The loyalty of Irish to the Stuart dynasty outlived it and continued throughout the 17 century and first half of 18 century, forming the phenomenon of Irish Jacobitism<sup>5</sup>. In the poetry of the end of the century Irish bards expressed nostalgia about three crowns: "... go suífidh an leanbh i gceannas na dtrí ríochta ní sultmhar mo labhairt is is searbh mo

<sup>4</sup> Keating highlights that these qualities characterised Irish throughout their history [Keating 1908, p. 347–369].

<sup>5</sup> See [Ó Buachalla 1996; Loyalty and identity: Jacobites... 2010; Ó Ciardha 2002].



chaoinlaoithe” (Until the baby accepts the three crowns, My speech will be sorrowful and my mourning will be bitter) [Ó Buachalla 1983, p. 129].

The Irish attitude towards Stuarts resembles that of the Old English: the former conceived the king, who they regarded as their own, to be a shield against English and Protestant threats. Even though the political vocabulary of the Gaelic learned classes changed because of continental influence and such terms as an *choróin* (the crown), *teideal* (title), *réim* (writ), *prionsa* (sovereign), a *mhórdhacht* (his Majesty), an *maitheas poiblidhe* (the common-wealth) entered the language [Ó Buachalla 1983, p. 129], poetry seems to have been written in traditional conventions of praise-genre, which Irish bards wrote to their patrons with a territorial motif usually being present. That is why, it is not surprising at the same time that the bards in the famous “Contention of the bards” argued about whose half — Leath Cuinn or Leath Moga — James belonged to [Ó Buachalla 1983, p. 126]. The existence of an acknowledged “high king”, shared religion, and the idea of territorial unity was contrasted by disunity of the real life in the Gaelic case.

Loyalty to Stuarts was combined with disappointment with the collapse of Gaelic Ireland and traditional social order as well as with the opposition to the government of Ireland led by the Foreigners and Protestants. Keating’s version of patriotism could not be shared by his colleagues because of its historical paradigm: the majority of *aes dána* could not come to terms with the conquest of Ireland except for Tadhg Dal Ó hUiginn, a poet of the Elizabethan age, who considered the English to be as just conquerors as Gaels by the right of conquest [Caball 2003, p. 126].

Keating’s scheme of Irish history had its competitors. One of them was Philip O Sullivan Beare, an Irish soldier living in Spain. Although in “*Historiae Catholicae Iberniae compendium*” his views on the purity of faith of the Gaels and their ancient civility coincided with Keating, he didn’t acknowledge the necessity of the Anglo-Norman conquest because the faith in Ireland flourished at that time whereas the conquerors only contributed to the decline of the Irish church and learning [O Sullivan Beare 1621, p. 58r-58v]. He criticized English law because the natives were deprived of the right of representation, and this is the reason why even the Kingship act of 1541 was not legitimate because it was done out of consideration for the opinion of the Irish nobility. Thus, Henry VIII obtained the kingly title without the approval of neither people, nor the Pope [O Sullivan Beare 1621, pp. 69–70]. O’Sullivan Beare defended the Gaelic case using the political constitutional arguments of the Old English whom he deemed inferior to Gaels in terms of purity of Catholic faith [O Sullivan Beare 1621, p. 110 r.]. Not only the famous Irish soldier, but also Conor O Mahony refuted the arguments for the Anglo-Norman invasion [Ó Fiaich 2001, p. 33].

Besides that, there was the genre of lament in which Irish poets grieved about decaying Ireland, its religion and social order: “Alas for the state of the Gaels” (*Mo thruaighe mar táid Gaoidhil*) [Measgra dánta=Miscellaneous... p. 144] and “Blessing on the soul of Ireland” (*Beannacht ar anmain Éireann* [Irish bardic poetry ]) by Fear Flatha Ó Gnimh [Ó Buachalla 1983, p.118]. The topos of Ireland as a fallen woman and dishonoured widow prevailed in seventeenth-century literature [Leerssen 1986, p. 217; Caball 2003, p. 120].

The literature in the Irish language of the first half of the seventeenth century, especially during the reign of Charles, was highly politicized, and the loyalty was a matter of individual choice. Some poets preserved the loyalty to exiled earls O’Neill and O’Donnell. Aindrias Mac Marcais wrote about the Flight of the Earls “*Anocht is uaigneach Éire*” [Leerssen 1986,

p. 192] (Tonight Ireland is desolate). The prophetic mode was a specific form of political poetry which predicted the return of the Gaelic order in future such as “Tuireamh na hÉireann” (Ireland’s Lament) by Sean Ó Conaill [Leerssen 1986, p. 213] or “Do frith, monuar, an uain sin ar Éirinn” (“Lament about woeful state in Ireland”) by Donnchadha Mac an Chaoilfhia-claigh who blamed James I and Charles I for the disaster in Ireland (because of their plantation policy, the English and Scots began to dominate in Ireland and Gaelic landowners were deprived of justice [Five seventeenth –century... pp. 8–9]). The above-mentioned Conor O Mahony advocated in “*Disputatio*” for the election of the king of Ireland from the Old Irish in the Confederate period, and his proposal was met with disapproval by the majority of loyal Confederates [Ó hAnnracháin 2000, p. 163].

Other addressees of loyalty were the Spanish kings as the protectors of the Catholic faith: Philip III and IV. Many exiles had gathered in Spain in attempts to prepare an invasion of Ireland. Archbishop of Tuam Florence Conry was responsible for its preparations promoting Owen Roe O’Neill and Owen Roe O’Donnell as captain-generals [Ó Fiaich 2001, pp. 27–29]. Philip O Sullivan Beare dedicated his “*Historiae catholicae...*” to Philip III, and hoped for a Spanish invasion of Ireland. To achieve this purpose not only did he try to demonstrate the civility and deep Catholic faith of Irish (as it was mentioned earlier), but also declared the noble Iberian origins of the Gaels [O Sullivan Beare 1621, p. 32v–32 r] (in such a way he interpreted the invasion myth of “Lebor Gabála”).

Geoffrey Keating’s patriotism as a compromising variant between two ethnic groups was not digested because of the following issues of legitimacy of Irish identity: the absence of gentile unity of Gaels and the Old English and ambiguous attitude towards the history of Ireland (especially its history before Anglo-Normans and the Anglo-Norman invasion). As a result, an incomplete processes of acculturation accounted for the co-existence of various forms of patriotism in Ireland.

The case of Ireland shows that patriotism is not restricted to only ethnic and territorial aspects, but is always mixed with other elements. In early Modern Ireland the confessional and political were in the foreground in the Civil Wars in Ireland in 1641–51 where-as the patriotic sentiments presented a framework for them.

Patrimonial patriotism revealed itself in the motto of the Confederation of Kilkenny “*Pro Deo, Pro Rege, Pro Patria, Hibernia Unanimis*”. The Old English and Gaels declared that they fought for the preservation of their liberties, religion and his Majesty’s prerogative. They were confident enough that Charles had taken their side and all what they did was done on his Majesty’s behalf.

The history of the conflict in Ireland shows the essence of patrimonial patriotism which was a form of conformism of Irish elites; but at the same time it stressed the right of distinction which was put under threat. Patriotism was a framework for pursuing confessional, political or social interests; it was instrumentalised in order to legitimize the claims. That is why patriotism had a target audience and was personified.

However, because of the difference in the interests of the elites, there was not one but different patriotisms in Ireland. Political groups of Confederation perceived differently the motto as well as its interests. It is not surprising that the Confederation suffered from disunity. In spite of the reconciliation, tensions and disbelief between the Old English and Gaels continued to exist [Ó hAnnracháin 2000, p. 164].

Therefore, we can posit some reflections of patrimonial patriotism in early Modern Ireland. Different forms of patriotism were a politicized phenomenon and had a mo-

narchical and Catholic nature. They were a rhetorical strategy, a declarative tool because those who professed loyalty to Stuarts usually opposed their policy [Clarke, Dudley Edwards 2009, p. 259]. Patriotism presented a form of symbolical exchange or payment for potential privileges.

On the theoretical level, the case of early Modern Ireland shows that identity can be a form of loyalty to the monarch/patron/state and it manifests itself in the time of crisis. Patriotic sentiments in Ireland were actualised in the dramatic time for the Catholic elites, and the most frequent patriotic appeals appeared during the reign of Charles I.

Even though it is hard to evaluate the level of patriotism extant in Ireland, we should emphasize its non-modern character. In the Old English case it was a 'judicial' patriotism in which '*patria*' was conceived as a place where people live, feed and have certain rights. The Gaelic patriotism was more territorial, and therefore more archaic. State was not the focus of those forms of patriotism.

It is worth highlighting that different modifications of patriotism, archaic and new ones, co-existed with each other. New political ideas were incorporated in traditional fabrics. We can mention political ideas of the Old English form of patriotism or Irish identity which was a result of the incomplete regentilization in Ireland, during which the Old English and Gaels began to re-fashion their identity.

The attempts to combine ethnocultural and ethnopolitical aspects in these forms of patriotism in the first half of the seventeenth century were unsuccessful because of the vulnerability of the new intellectual constructs, and they did not absorb traditional forms of consolidation. Nevertheless, their key element was the feeling of distinction, non-Englishness, which was articulated in different ways by Irish elites. The patriotic ideas actualised in the first half of the seventeenth century laid the foundations for future modern patriotisms — Irish Catholic patriotism and Anglo-Irish civic patriotism.

## References

- Bradshaw B. Native reaction to the westward enterprise: a case-study in Gaelic ideology. *The Westward Enterprise: English activities in Ireland, the Atlantic and America 1480–1650*. Eds K. R. Andrews, N. P. Canny, P. E. H. Hair. Detroit, Wayne State University Press, 1979a, pp. 66–80.
- Bradshaw B. *The Irish constitutional revolution of the sixteenth century*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1979b, 303 p.
- Caball M. Articulating Irish identity in early seventeenth century Europe: the case of Giolla Brighde Ó hEódhusa (c. 1570–1614). *Archivium Hibernicum*, 2009, vol. 62, pp. 271–293.
- Caball M. Bardic poetry and the analysis of Gaelic mentalities. *History Ireland*, 1994, vol.2, pp. 46–50.
- Caball M. Faith, culture and sovereignty: Irish nationality and its development, 1558–1625. *British consciousness and identity: the making of Britain, 1533–1707*. Eds B. Bradshaw, P. Roberts. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998, pp. 112–139.
- Calendar of the State Papers relating to Ireland of the reign of James I. 1603–1606*. London: Longman & Co., and Trubner & Co.; Oxford: Paternoster row; also by Parker & Co; Cambridge: and Macmillan & Co.; Edinburgh: A. & C. Black; Dublin: and A. Thom, 1872. 658 p.
- Calendar of the state papers relating to Ireland of the reign of Charles I 1633–1647. Reserved in the public record office*. Ed. by R. P. Mahaffy. London, for his Majesty's stationery office by the "Norfolk chronicle" company, Ltd., Norwich, 1901, 871 p.
- Canny N. *Kingdom and colony: Ireland in the Atlantic world, 1560–1800*. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988, 149 p.
- Canny N. *Making Ireland British, 1580–1650*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2001, 633 p.
- Clarke A. *The Old English in Ireland, 1625–42*. Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1966, 287 p.
- Clarke A., Dudley Edwards R. Pacification, plantation, and the catholic question, 1603–23. *A new history of Ireland. Vol. III: Early Modern Ireland*. Eds T. Moody, F. X. Martin, F. J. Byrne. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2009, pp. 187–232.

- Corish P.J. The origins of Catholic nationalism. *History of Irish Catholicism*. Vol. 3. Dublin, Gill Publ., 1968, pp. 1–64.
- Cunningham B. *The annals of the Four masters: Irish history, kingship and society in the early seventeenth century*. Dublin, Four Courts Press, 2010, 348 p.
- Cunningham B. *The world of Geoffrey Keating: history, myth and religion in seventeenth-century Ireland*. Dublin, Four Courts Press, 2004, 263 p.
- Dánta amhrain is caointe Sheatrúin Céitinn: dochtúir diadachta (1570–1650 AD) [Poetry, songs and psalms by Geoffrey Keating: doctor of theology]. Baile Áta Cliath, Connrad na Gaedilge [Dublin, the Gaelic League] 1900, 224 p. (In Irish)
- Darcy P. *An argument delivered by Patrick Darcy, esquire by the expresse order of the House of Commons in the Parliament of Ireland*, 9 iunii, 1641. (In Lat.) Available at: <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A36769.0001.001/1:2.2?rgn=div2;view=fulltext> (accessed 25.07.2016).
- Dunne T.J. The Gaelic response to conquest and colonization: the evidence of the poetry. *Studia Hibernica*, 1980, vol.20, pp. 7–30.
- Elliott J.H. Europe of Composite Monarchies. *Past & Present*, 1992, no.137, pp. 48–71.
- Elliott J.H. Evolution and continuity in early modern Europe. *Present and Past*, 1969, no. 42, pp. 35–56.
- Fedorov S. Britanskaja identichnost' / identichnosti v rannee Novoe vremya [British identity/identities in the early Modern time]. *Vestnik of Saint-Petersburg State University*. Series 2. 2013a, issue 3, pp. 75–82. (In Russian)
- Fedorov S. Rannestuartovskaya monarkhia i ee kompositi [Early Stuart monarchy and its composites]. *Mnemon: issledovania i publikazii antichnogo mira* [Mnemon: studies and publications of the Antiquity], 2013b, vol. 12, pp. 473–484. (In Russian)
- Fedorov S. "Restored to the Whole Empire & Name of Great Briteigne": kompositarnaja monarhija i ee granizi pri pervih Stjuartah ["Restored to the Whole Empire & Name of Great Briteigne": composite monarchy and its boundaries during the reign of early Stuarts]. *Imperii i etnonacionalnije gosudarstva v Zapadnoj Evrope v Srednie Veka i Rannee Novoje Vremia* [Empires and ethnonational state in the Middle Ages and early Modern time]. Ed. by N. Hachaturian. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 2011, pp. 202–224. (In Russian)
- Five seventeenth-century political poems*. Ed. by C. O'Rahilly. Dublin, Dublin Institute for Advanced studies Publ., 1977, 181 p.
- Frame R. Exporting state and nation: being English in medieval Ireland. *Power and the nation in the European history*. Eds. L. Scales, O. Zimmer. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2005, pp. 143–165.
- Hadfield A. Briton and Scythian: Tudor representations of Irish origins. *Irish Historical Studies*, 1993, vol.28, pp. 390–408.
- Hayes-McCoy G.A. The royal supremacy and ecclesiastical revolution, 1534–47. *A new history of Ireland. Volume III: Early Modern Ireland*. Eds T. Moody, F.X. Martin, F.J. Byrne. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2009, pp. 39–68.
- Hill J. Ireland without union: Molyneux and his legacy. *A union for empire: political thought and the British Union of 1707*. Ed. by J. Robertson. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995, pp. 271–296.
- Irish bardic poetry*. Ed. by O. Bergin. Dublin, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies Publ., 1970. Available at: <http://www.ucc.ie/celt/published/G402225/index.html> (accessed 28.07.2016).
- Keating G. *Foras Feasa ar Éirinn: the history of Ireland*. Ed. by D. Comyn. Vol. 1. London, Irish Texts Society, 1902, 256 p.
- Keating G. *Foras Feasa ar Éirinn: the history of Ireland*. Ed. by P.S. Dineen. Vol. 3. London, Irish Texts Society, 1908, 387 p.
- Kidd C. *British identities before nationalism: Ethnicity and nationhood in the Atlantic world, 1600–1800*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2004, 312 p.
- Lebor Gabála Érenn. The book of the Taking of Ireland. Part 1*. Ed. by R. A. S. Macalister. Dublin, Irish Texts Society, 1938, 269 p.
- Lebor Gabála Érenn. The book of the Taking of Ireland. Part 2*. Ed. by R. A. S. Macalister. Dublin, Irish Texts Society, 1939, 273 p.
- Lebor Gabála Érenn. The book of the Taking of Ireland. Part 3*. Ed. by R. A. S. Macalister. Dublin, Irish Texts Society, 1940, 206 p.
- Lebor Gabála Érenn. The book of the Taking of Ireland. Part 4*. Ed. by R. A. S. Macalister. Dublin, Irish Texts Society, 1941, 342 p.
- Lebor Gabála Érenn. The book of the Taking of Ireland. Part 5*. Ed. by R. A. S. Macalister. Dublin, Publ. Irish Texts Society, 1956, 591 p.

- Leerssen J. *Mere Irish & fíor-ghael: studies in the idea of Irish nationality, its development, and literary expression prior to the nineteenth century*. Amsterdam (Philadelphia), John Benjamins Pub. Co, 1986, 535 p.
- Leerssen J. *National thought in Europe: a cultural history*. Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 2006, 382 p.
- Lombard P. *De regno Hiberniae sanctorum insula commentaries*. Lovanii, Apud viduam Steph. Martini, 1632, 492 p.
- Loyalty and identity: Jacobites at home and abroad*. Eds P. Monod, M. Pittock, D. Szechi. Basingstoke (UK); New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, 269 p.
- Mccabe R. A. *Spenser's Monstrous Regiment: Elizabethan Ireland and the Poetics of Difference*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005, 306 p.
- Martin F. X. *Friar Nugent: a study of Francis Lavalin Nugent (1569–1635), agent of the Counter-Reformation*. Rome; London, Capuchin Historical Institute, 1962, 356 p.
- Measgra dánta = Miscellaneous Irish poems*. Ed. by T. F. O'Rahilly. Cork, Cork University Press, 1927, 277 p. (In Irish)
- Ó Buachalla B. *Aisling Ghéar: Na Stíobhartaigh agus an t-Aos Léinn 1601–1788 [Vision poems: Stuarts and the learned class 1601–1788]*. Baile Átha Cliath, An Clóchomhar, 1996, 808 p. (In Irish)
- Ó Buachalla B. Cúlra is tábhacht an dáin A leabhráin ainmnighthe d'Aodh [Background and significance of the poem 'O little book in honour of Hugh']. *Celtica*, 1990, vol. 21, pp. 402–416. (In Irish)
- Ó Buachalla B. James our true king: the ideology of Irish royalism in the seventeenth century. *Irish political thought since the seventeenth century*. Eds D. G. Boyce, R. R. Eccleshall, V. Geoghegan. London, Routledge Publ., 1993, pp. 7–35.
- Ó Buachalla B. Na Stíobhartaigh agus an taos léinn: Cing Séamas [Stuarts and the learned class: king James]. *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy. Section C: Archaeology, Celtic Studies, History, Linguistics, Literature*, 1983, vol. 83C, pp. 81–134. (In Irish)
- Ó Ciardha É. *Ireland and the Jacobite cause, 1685–1766: a fatal attachment*. Dublin, Four Courts Press, 2002, 468 p.
- Ó Fiaich T. "Republicanism and separatism in the seventeenth century". *The Republic*, 2001, no. 2, pp. 25–37.
- Ó hAnnracháin T. "Though Hereticks and Politicians should misinterpret their good zeale": political ideology and Catholicism in early modern Ireland. *Political thought in seventeenth-century Ireland: kingdom or colony*. Ed. by J. H. Ohlmeyer. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000, pp. 155–175.
- O Riordan M. *The Gaelic mind and the collapse of the Gaelic world*. Cork, Cork University Press, 1990, 328 p.
- Sullivan Beare P. *Historiae catholicae Iberniae compendium...* Vlyssippone, Excusum a Petro Crasbeeckio ..., 1621, 283 ff. (In Latin)
- Patriotism. *Encyclopedia of Nationalism*. Ed. by A. J. Motyl. Vol. 2. San Diego, Academic Press, 2001, p. 407.
- Post G. Two notes on Nationalism, the Middle Ages. *Traditio*, 1953, vol. 9, pp. 281–320.
- Saothar filidheachta an athar Padraigín Haicéad d'ord San Doiminic [Poetical works of the father Pádraigín Haicéad of the Dominican order]*. Ed. by T. Ua Donnchadha. Baile Átha Cliath, Gill Publ., 1916, 192 p. (In Irish)
- Silke J. J. Primate Lombard and James I. *Irish Theological Quarterly*, 1955, XXII, pp. 124–150.
- Verner K. F., Gshhnizer F., Kozellek R., Sheneman B. Narod, nazija, nazionalizm, massa [People, nation, nationalism, mass]. *Slovar' osnovnih istoricheskikh poniatij [The handbook of main historical concepts]*. Vol. 2. Moscow, NLO Publ., 2014, pp. 322–752. (In Russian)

Received: 29 August 2016

Accepted: 26 January 2017